



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,176	08/06/2001	John E. McCall	00163.1559US01	9866
23552	7590	04/12/2005		EXAMINER
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			DIXON, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/923,176	MCCALL, JOHN E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas A. Dixon	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/01 6/03 10/03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The IDS submitted on 11/01, 6/03 and 10/03 have been considered.

Claim Interpretation

2. Claims Directed to an Apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function, *In re Danly* 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 582, 531 (CCPA 1959).

A claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1657 (bd Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

The structural limitations of claim 21, including a data collector, an advisory module and a registration/communication module are disclosed in Wakefield II (5,961,561) and Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) as described herein.

Also as described the limitations of the claim do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase “the field service person” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Specifically, a claim directed to or including within its scope a human being will not be considered to be patentable subject matter under 35 USC § 101, *In re Wakefield*, 422 F.2d 897, 165 USPQ 636 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-11, 21-28, 30-32, 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Wakefield II* (5,961,561).

As per Claim 1, 25.

Wakefield II ('561) discloses:

accessing a customer account record based on a customer identifier input by a field service provider, see figure 2 (34);
accessing a data-type record of the customer record, the data-type record storing advisory information associated with the customer account identifier, the advisory information formatted in one or more languages, see figure 6 (56);
selecting from the data type record customized advisor information formatted to a language associated with the field service provider, see figure 6 (56);
presenting the customized advisory information to the field service provider through the network device, see figure 6.

As per Claim 2, 26.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses the field service provider is a person associated with a natural language and the customized advisory information selected by the selecting act is formatted in the natural language, see figure 6 (62).

As per Claim 3 27.

Art Unit: 3639

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses field service provider is a computing module associated with a computer based language and the customized advisory information selected by the selecting act is formatted in the computer-based language, see figure 6 (code 33)

As per Claim 4, 28.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses the customer account identifier is associated with a destination facility, see figure 4.

As per Claim 6, 30.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses the customer account identifier is associated with a utility device at the destination facility, see abstract.

As per Claim 7, 31.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses formatting the customized advisory information to a presentation format based on the network device through which the field service provider is accessing the network advisory system, see figures 6,7 and column 4, lines 44-50.

As per Claim 8, 32.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses the presentation format is textual, see figure 6.

As per Claim 10, 34.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses:

receiving collected data associated with a data type, see column 2, lines 3-4;

generating a data conclusion based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type, see column 2, lines 43-54 and column 4, lines 23-50;

mapping the data conclusion to the advisory information, see figure 6 (code 33, and text explanation);

storing the advisory information in a storage module including one or more customer account records each including one or more data-type records, see figure 2 (34, 86, 124, 150, 168, 174).

As per Claim 11, 35.

Wakefield II ('561) further discloses:

selectively storing the advisory information in a customer account record based on a customer account identifier associated with the collected data from which the advisory information was generated, see figures 2-4;

selectively storing the advisory information in a data-type record of the customer account record based on the data type associated with the collected data from which the advisory information was generated, see figures 2-4.

Art Unit: 3639

As per Claim 21.

Wakefield II ('561) discloses:

a data collector, see figure 1 (10);

an advisory module, see (12);

a registration/communication module, see (13, 14).

As per Claims 22-24.

The limitations of the claims do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

6. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Doherty et al (6,735,293).

As per Claim 12.

Doherty et al ('293) discloses:

receiving an provider identifier associated with the field service provider, see figure 5A (322);

receiving a customer account record based on a customer identifier input by a field service provider, see figure 5A (306);

selecting a specific data conclusion based on the customer account identifier, see figure 5A (300);

mapping the specific data conclusion to advisory information customized to a language format associated with the field provider as specified by the provider identifier, see column 9, lines 55-56; and

presenting the customized advisory information to the field service provider through the network device, see column 10, lines 4-6.

As per Claim 13.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses the service provider is a person associated with a natural language and the customized advisory information is formatted in the natural language, see column 10, lines 4-6.

As per Claim 14.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses the service provider is a computing module associated with a computer-based language and the customized advisory information is formatted in the computer-based language, see column 9, lines 20-56.

As per Claim 15.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses receiving a customer account identifier identifying the destination facility at which the service is to be provided, see column 9, lines 35-43.

As per Claim 16.

Art Unit: 3639

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses providing the work order to the service technician via pager or email, which can receive messages at any time, including while the technician is in transit, see column 10, lines 4-6.

As per Claim 17.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses the destination facility is associated with a customer of a service providing company employing the field service person to provide the service to the customer on behalf of the service providing company, see column 2, lines 21-44.

As per Claim 18.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses the destination facility is associated with a customer of a service providing company, see column 2, lines 21-44.

As per Claim 19.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses formatting the customized advisory information to a presentation format based on the network device through which the field service provider is accessing the network advisory system, see column 10, lines 4-6.

As per Claim 20.

Doherty et al ('293) further discloses the format is text, see column 10, lines 4-6.

7. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Koropitzer et al (5,694,323).

As per Claim 21.

Koropitzer et al ('323) discloses:

a data collector, see column 4, lines 1-30;

an advisory module, see column 9, lines 26-64;

a registration/communication module, see column 12, lines 44-51.

As per Claims 22-24.

The limitations of the claims do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3639

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakefield II (5,961,561) in view of Doherty et al (6,735,293).

As per Claim 5, 29.

Wakefield does not specifically disclose transmitting advisory information to the field service provider as the field service provider is in transit between a first destination facility and a second destination facility.

Doherty et al ('293) teaches providing the work order to the service technician via pager or email, which can receive messages at any time, including while the technician is in transit, see column 10, lines 4-6, for the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit information to the field service provider between a first destination and a second destination for the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

9. Claims 9, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakefield II (5,961,561) in view of Garber et al (4,905,163).

As per Claim 9.

Wakefield II ('561) does not specifically disclose determining the language to which the customized advisory information is formatted based on a provider identifier input by the field service provider,

Garber et al ('163) teaches the calling system selecting language based on the provider identifier input by the user, see column 33, lines 29-46 for the benefit of providing language appropriate to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to select the language based on the provider identifier input by the user for the benefit of providing language appropriate to the user.

Prior Art Made of Record

- 10 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3639

WO 00/0237 to Hart et al is the closest prior art that teaches using Short Message Service to notify technicians of work with text messages on a digital cell phone.

Sawyers "Troubleshooting tech turn to Net is the closest non-patent literature.

Sisley et al (5,467,268) teaches a system of matching jobs with technicians who have the skill level to perform the job.


Garber (4,905,163) teaches presenting material based on the user's level of understanding.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Dixon whose telephone number is (571) 272-6803. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thomas A. Dixon
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3639

March 05